



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,742	02/06/2002	Mark R. Hansen	077077-9141-00	2995

7590 10/24/2003

David B. Smith
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4108

EXAMINER

SAFAIPOUR, HOUSHANG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/072,742	Applicant(s) HANSEN ET AL.	
Examiner Houshang Safaipoor	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other:

Art Unit: 2622

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sikes (U.S. Patent No. 5,018,213)

Regarding claim 1, Sikes discloses a camera assembly of a printing press comprising:

a housing (fig. 1A);

an image sensor positioned within said housing and adapted to acquire images of a moving substrate of a printing press (col. 1, lines 52-68);

a light source positioned within said housing (col. 3, lines 14-58);

an optics assembly positioned within said housing (col. 3, lines 14-58);

a microprocessor positioned within said housing (col. 3, line 59 through col. 4, line35);

and

image processing hardware positioned within said housing and adapted to analyze the acquired images of the substrate (col. 3, line 59 through col. 4, line35).

Regarding claim 2, Sikes discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image sensor is a CCD scanner (col. 1, lines 52-68).

Regarding claim 4, Sikes discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said light source is a strobe type light (col. 3, lines 14-42).

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 8, Sikes discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 and further including a power supply (fig. 3).

Regarding claim 9, Sikes discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 and further including a communication interface (col. 3, line 59 through col. 4, line35).

Regarding claim 11, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable to claim 11.

Regarding claim 14, Sikes discloses a camera assembly for use in scanning a paper substrate of a printing press and determining color register error, said assembly comprising:

a housing (fig. 1A);

a camera positioned within said housing for acquiring images of the substrate (fig. 3A, camera 116);

a light source positioned within said housing (fig. 3A);

an optics assembly positioned within said housing (col. 3, lines 14-58); and

image processing hardware positioned within said housing for processing the acquired images and determining any color register error (col. 3, line 59, through col. 5, line 20).

Regarding claim 16, Sikes discloses a method of determining color register error on a printing press, said method comprising:

providing a camera assembly having mounted therein a scanner and image processing hardware for acquiring an image of a paper substrate of a printing press (fig. 3A, camera 116);

processing the image with the image processing hardware to determine any color register error (col. 3, line 59, through col. 5, line 20); and

transferring the color register error information externally of the camera assembly (col. 3,

line 59, through col. 5, line 20).

Regarding claim 17, Sikes discloses a method of determining color register error of a printing press, said method comprising:

scanning a paper substrate at a desired location with a camera assembly having mounted, within a housing, a scanner and image processing hardware to obtain an image (fig. 3A, camera 116);

processing the image with the image processing hardware to determine a color register error (col. 3, line 59, through col. 5, line 20); and

transferring the error information externally of the camera assembly to effect color registration of the printing press (col. 3, line 59, through col. 5, line 20).

Regarding claim 18, Sikes discloses a camera assembly for use in scanning a paper substrate of a printing press, obtaining an image, and processing the image all within the assembly, the printing press having a side frame and the paper substrate have an extremity, said assembly comprising:

a housing dimensioned so that said housing is mountable at the extremity of the paper substrate without interference from the side frame of the printing press (figs. 1A and 1B);

a camera positioned within said housing (fig. 3, camera 116);

a light source positioned within said housing (fig. 3, light source 112);

an optics assembly positioned within said housing (col. 3, lines 14-58); and

image processing hardware positioned within said housing (col. 3, line 59 through col. 4, line 35).

Regarding claim 19, Sikes discloses the camera assembly of claim 18 wherein said

Art Unit: 2622

housing has a width dimension of no more than four inches (fig. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sikes (U.S. Patent No. 5,018,213) and further in view of Miyauchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,733).

Regarding claim 3, Neither Sikes nor Miyauchi et al. discloses a camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image sensor is an area scanner. The use of area scanner is well known and routinely implemented in scanning art as admitted by the applicant (Page 6, line 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the use of area scanner in combination of Sikes and Miyauchi .

Regarding claim 5, Sikes does not explicitly disclose the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said optics assembly include a lens. Miyauchi et al. discloses such a device (fig. 4). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miyauchi's device with that of Sikes in order to apply the light uniformly to the surface of the paper web.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 6, Sikes does not explicitly disclose the camera assembly of claim 5 wherein said optics assembly includes at least one mirror. Miyauchi et al. discloses such a device (fig. 4, mirror 23). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Miyauchi's device with that of Sikes in order to apply the light uniformly to the surface of the paper web.

Regarding claim 7, Neither Sikes nor Miyauchi et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image processing hardware includes at least one FPGA. The use of FPGA is well known and routinely implemented in scanning art (Official Notice). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the use of FPGA in combination of Sikes and Miyauchi .

Regarding claims 10 and 15, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 7 are applicable to claims 10 and 15.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 2 and 7 are applicable to claims 12 and 13.

Regarding claim 20, Sikes does not explicitly disclose a camera assembly to include at least one rib. Enclosures with ribs are well known and routinely implemented in scanning art (Official Notice). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include ribs in the enclosure assembly of Sikes apparatus to improve heat dissipation.

Art Unit: 2622


Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Houshang Safaipoor whose telephone number is (703)306-4037.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles, Sr. can be reached on (703)305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-0377.

 Houshang Safaipoor
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2622
October 3, 2003


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600